THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 21267 OF 2005

29-09-2005

Between:

R.Susheelamma.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Accountant General (A & E), Hyderabad & Another.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No. 21267 OF 2005

ORDER :

The husband of the petitioner retired as a District Judge and was being paid pension by the District Treasury Office, Prakasam at

Ongole under P.P.O. bearing No.17-S-OC 3101. On his request, the Pension Account was transferred to the Pension Payment Office at Hyderabad. To that effect, the Pension Payment Office at Hyderabad issued proceedings, dated 11.08.1997. Ever since then, the husband of the petitioner and after his death, the petitioner herself, have been receiving the pension from that office.

The petitioner submitted a representation for revision of her family pension in view of the recent amendment to the pay structure. Based on that, the 1st respondent passed an amendment order, dated 17.11.2004, revising the family pension payable to the petitioner. However, this order was communicated to the District Treasury Officer-cum-Pension Payment Officer, Prakasam at Ongole. After the petitioner came to know about this development, she submitted a representation on 22.09.2005, requesting the 1st respondent to communicate the amendment order to the Pension Payment Office at Hyderabad, the 2nd respondent herein. Her grievance is that no action has been taken thereafter.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Finance and Planning.

It is a matter of record that the Pension Account of the husband of the petitioner was transferred from District Treasury Office, Prakasam at Ongole to Pension Payment Office at Hyderabad way back in the year 1997. On the request of the petitioner, the 1st respondent revised the family pension through amendment order, dated 17.11.2004. Obviously, by taking into account the Treasury Office which was initially paying the pension to the husband of the petitioner, the 1st respondent communicated that order to the District Treasury Office, Prakasam at Ongole. The petitioner cannot derive any benefit out of it, because, she is not drawing the family pension from the District Treasury Office, Prakasam at Ongole. She would get the benefit of the order, if only the amendment order is communicated to the 2nd respondent.

For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the 1st respondent to communicate the amendment order of family pension of the petitioner, to the 2nd respondent within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

_____

29th SEPTEMBER, 2005

ajr